

**2010-2011  
Supplemental Educational Services  
Application Rubric**

**Entity Name:**

---

**Reviewer:**

---

**1. Financial Soundness and Management Structure – 30 points possible; must receive a score of 14 or higher to be recommended for approval.**

**Rationale:** NCLB Section 1116(e)(12)(B)(iii) requires providers to be financially sound. The application will be evaluated on the applicant entity’s ability to demonstrate financial soundness and sound management structure through a review of financial and licensure documentation. ***Incomplete applications without required attachments will not be reviewed.***

**Evidence of Cash On-Hand – 5 Points Possible**

Applicants must provide evidence that there is enough cash-on-hand to support the business for at least six months. Some examples of sufficient evidence are: savings account or checking account statements, notarized letters from investors identifying the investment amount available, evidence of an available line of credit or loan from a financial institution.

**Has the applicant included cash-on-hand documentation?**

Yes  No

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
<p>Applicant documents indicate there is <b>insufficient cash-on-hand to support the business for at least six months</b> to serve the maximum number of students per district.</p> <p>No evidence of cash-on-hand is included in the cash flow document.</p>	<p>Applicant documents indicate there is <b>enough cash-on-hand to support the business for at least six months</b> to serve the maximum number of students per district.</p> <p>Evidence of cash-on-hand is included in the cash flow document.</p>	<p>Applicant documents <b>provide detailed evidence there is more than enough cash-on-hand to support the business for at least six months</b> to serve the maximum number of students per district.</p> <p>Evidence of cash-on-hand is included in the cash flow document.</p>	

**Criterion 1 rubric continues on the next page**

**Cash Flow Document(s) – 5 Points Possible**

Applicants must provide an organizational cash flow that accounts for all **monthly projected revenue and expenses** for at least **twelve months, ending in June 2011**.

<i>Has the applicant included cash flow documents?</i>			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
Cash flow documents are <b>unclear and/or do not account</b> for the majority of projected monthly revenue and expenses for at least twelve months ending in June 2011.  Cash flow documents do not agree with the comprehensive list of expenses.	Cash flow documents are <b>reasonable and account</b> for the majority of projected monthly revenue and expenses for at least twelve months ending in June 2011.  Cash flow <b>documents generally agree</b> with the comprehensive list of expenses for the minimum and maximum number of students per district.	Cash flow documents are <b>comprehensive, clear, and reasonable and account</b> for all projected monthly revenue and expenses for at least twelve months ending in June 2011.  Cash flow <b>documents are in total agreement</b> with the comprehensive list of expenses for the minimum and maximum number of students per district.	

**Comprehensive List of Expenses – 5 Points Possible**

Applicants must provide a comprehensive list of expenses necessary to serve the **minimum and maximum number of students per district**.

<i>Has the applicant included a comprehensive list of expenses for both the minimum and maximum number of students per district?</i>			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
Comprehensive list of expenses is <b>not likely</b> to serve the minimum and maximum number of students per district identified in the application.	Comprehensive list of expenses is <b>likely</b> to serve the minimum and maximum number of students per district identified in the application.	Comprehensive list of expenses is <b>more than likely</b> to serve the minimum and maximum number of students per district identified in the application.	

**Criterion 1 rubric continues on the next page**

### Business License – 3 Points Possible

Applicants must provide a copy of their business license or formal documentation of legal status with respect to conducting business in Michigan or another state (e.g., certificate of incorporation, proof of 501(c)(3) tax-exempt status).

<i>Has the applicant included this documentation?</i>			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Not Recommended (0 points)	Recommended (1 -2 points)	Highly Recommended (3 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 3 POINTS</b>
Business license or other formal documentation of legal status to conduct business <b>in Michigan or other state(s) is invalid.</b>	Business license or other formal documentation of legal status to conduct business <b>in other state(s) is valid.</b>	Business license or other formal documentation of legal status to conduct business <b>in Michigan is valid.</b>	

### Insurance Documentation – 3 Points Possible

Applicants must provide a copy of their general liability insurance or a quote from an insurance agency that reflects their intent to obtain liability insurance.

<i>Has the applicant included this documentation?</i>			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Not Recommended (0 points)	Recommended (1 -2 points)	Highly Recommended (3 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 3 POINTS</b>
Proof of liability insurance is <b>insufficient and/or excluded</b> from the comprehensive list of expenses.	Proof of <b>general liability</b> insurance <b>is provided and included</b> in the cash flow and comprehensive list of expenses for the minimum and maximum number of students per district.	Proof of <b>general and professional</b> liability insurance for a <b>minimum of \$1,000,000 is provided and included</b> in the cash flow and comprehensive list of expenses for the minimum and maximum number of students per district.	

### Invoice(s) – 3 Points Possible

Applicants must provide sample invoices and/or other business documents for students that will receive tutoring services.

<i>Has the applicant included a sample invoice or billing document for services rendered??</i>			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
Not Recommended (0 points)	Recommended (1 -2 points)	Highly Recommended (3 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 3 POINTS</b>
Sample invoices and other business documents are <b>unclear and do not indicate</b> there is a management structure related to <b>billing and payment for tutoring students in place.</b>	Sample invoices and other business documents <b>indicate</b> there is a management structure related to <b>billing and payment for tutoring students in place.</b>	Sample invoices and other business documents <b>indicate</b> there is a <b>comprehensive</b> management structure related to <b>billing and payment for tutoring students in place.</b>	

**Criterion 1 rubric continues on the next page**

### Financial Narrative – 3 Points Possible

Applicants must provide a one-page narrative explaining how the financial documents submitted with the application represent a strong business plan.

**Has the applicant included a financial narrative?**  Yes  No

Not Recommended (0 points)	Recommended (1 -2 points)	Highly Recommended (3 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 3 POINTS</b>
Financial narrative is <b>unclear and it is difficult to understand</b> how the financial documents represent a strong business plan.	Financial narrative provides a <b>reasonable understanding</b> of how the financial documents <b>represent a relatively stable</b> business plan.	Financial narrative provides a <b>comprehensive understanding</b> of how the financial documents <b>represent a strong</b> business plan.	

### Hourly Fee/Calculated Hours of Instruction – 3 Points Possible

#### Calculated Hours of Instruction

\$2000.00	÷	Maximum fee per hour (application section A, question #19)	=	<b><u>Calculated hours of instruction</u></b>	≥	Minimum number of hours required for student to achieve their individualized learning goals (application section A, question #18)
\$2000.00	÷		=		≥	

**a) Is hourly rate likely to allow minimum hours of instruction?**  Yes  No

**b) If the answer to question a) is "No", does the applicant entity ever lower the hourly rate to guarantee each student receives a specific number of service hours?**  
(application section A, question #19)  Yes  No

Not Recommended (0 points)	Recommended (1 -2 points)	Highly Recommended (3 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 3 POINTS</b>
The answer to both a) and b) above is no.  <b>THE APPLICATION IS NOT REVIEWED FURTHER AND IS NOT CONSIDERED FOR APPROVAL</b>	The hourly fee is <b>adequate and likely</b> to allow students the minimum hours necessary to increase achievement.  The <b>calculated hours</b> of instruction meet or <b>slightly exceed</b> the number of hours necessary for student success identified in application question #18.  <b>OR:</b>  The applicant will lower their hourly fee to guarantee each student receives a specific number of service hours.	The hourly fee is <b>more than adequate;</b> the <b>calculated hours</b> of instruction <b>exceed</b> the number of <b>hours necessary for student success</b> identified in application question #18 <b>by 4 or more</b> hours.	

**Criterion 1 comments are on the next page**

**Comments**

**Are all financial documents included?** \_\_\_\_\_

(if the answer is no, the application is not reviewed further and is not considered for approval)

**Points this Section, Maximum of 30:** \_\_\_\_\_

(Must score 14 or higher to be recommended)

**2. Demonstrated Record of Effectiveness – 15 points possible; must receive a score of 7 or higher to be recommended for approval.**

**Rationale:** Providers must have a demonstrated record of effectiveness in increasing the academic proficiency of students in subjects relevant to meeting the state academic content and student achievement standards [NCLB of 2001, Section 1116(e)(4)(B)]. In addition, an applicant must provide evidence that its instructional methods and content are aligned with state academic content and student academic achievement standards, and are of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of eligible children (Final Title I Regulations of October, 2008).

**Positive Impact on Michigan State Assessments – 4 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-1 points)	Recommended (2-3 points)	Highly Recommended (4 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 4 POINTS</b>
<p><b>Data does not demonstrate</b> the applicant's <b>proposed delivery model, methods, or curriculum have a positive impact</b> related to the Michigan state assessments (MEAP and/or MME).</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>Data demonstrates</b> the applicant's <b>proposed delivery model, methods, or curriculum have a positive impact</b> on achievement on the Michigan state assessments (MEAP and/or MME) for the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	<p><b>Detailed data</b> is provided that the applicant's <b>proposed delivery model, methods, or curriculum have a positive impact</b> on achievement on the Michigan state assessments (MEAP and/or MME) for the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	

**Positive Impact On Other Assessments – 4 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-1 points)	Recommended (2-3 points)	Highly Recommended (4 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 4 POINTS</b>
<p><b>Data does not demonstrate</b> the applicant's <b>proposed delivery model, methods, or curriculum have a positive impact</b> on national, another state's, district's, or provider administered assessments in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>Data demonstrates</b> the applicant's <b>proposed delivery model, methods, or curriculum have a positive impact</b> on national, another state's, district's, or provider administered assessments in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	<p><b>Detailed data</b> is provided that the applicant's <b>proposed delivery model, methods, or curriculum have a positive impact</b> on national, another state's, district's, or provider administered assessments in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	

**Criterion 2 rubric continues on next page**

**Positive Impact On Other Indicators – 4 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-1 points)	Recommended (2-3 points)	Highly Recommended (4 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 4 POINTS</b>
<p><b>Data does not demonstrate</b> the applicant’s <b>proposed delivery model, methods, or curriculum have a positive impact</b> on other indicators (e.g., course grades, student attendance, student behavior/discipline, retention/promotion rates, or graduation rates) in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>Data demonstrates</b> the applicant’s <b>proposed delivery model, methods, or curriculum have a positive impact on at least one other indicator</b> (e.g., course grades, student attendance, student behavior/discipline, retention/promotion rates, or graduation rates) in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	<p><b>Detailed data</b> is provided that the applicant’s <b>proposed delivery model, methods, or curriculum have a positive impact on multiple indicators</b> (e.g., course grades, student attendance, student behavior/discipline, retention/promotion rates, or graduation rates) in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	

**Positive Feedback From Constituents – 3 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0 points)	Recommended (1-2 points)	Highly Recommended (3 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 3 POINTS</b>
<p><b>Narrative does not include any positive feedback</b> from constituents (parent(s)/guardian(s), students, LEAs) related to the effectiveness of the instructional program in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>Narrative includes positive feedback</b> from <b>at least one constituent group</b> (parent(s)/guardian(s), students, LEAs) related to the effectiveness of the instructional program in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	<p><b>Narrative includes multiple examples of positive feedback from several constituents</b> (parent(s)/guardian(s), students, LEAs) related to the effectiveness of the instructional program in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	

**Criterion 2 comments are on the next page**

**Comments**

**Points this Section, Maximum of 15:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Must score 7 or higher to be recommended)

**3. Evidence of a High Quality, Research-Based Instructional Program – 10 points possible; must receive a score of 6 or higher to be recommended for approval.**

**Rationale:** By definition, SES is tutoring and other enrichment services that are high quality, based on research, and designed to increase student academic achievement [NCLB, Section 1116(e)(12)(C)(2)]. According to the U.S. Department of Education (January 14, 2009), the major focus of NCLB is to utilize *only* those educational practices that have evidence to suggest that they will increase academic achievement (see *Federal Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance*). In addition, an applicant must provide evidence that its instructional methods and content are aligned with state academic content and student academic achievement standards, and are of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of eligible children (Final Title I Regulations of October, 2008).

**Instructional Program – 5 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
<p><b>Few of the major elements</b> of the instructional program, including specific instructional strategies/methods, time on task, special instructional materials, use of technology, and other relevant program components are identified.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>Some to most of the major elements</b> of the instructional program, including specific instructional strategies/methods, time on task, special instructional materials, use of technology, and other relevant program components are identified and supported by research.</p>	<p><b>All major elements</b> of the instructional program, including specific instructional strategies, time on task, special instructional materials, use of technology, and other relevant program components are listed and supported by research.</p>	

**Criterion 3 rubric continues on next page**

**Research – 5 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
<p><b>Research information does not demonstrate</b> a clear relationship between instructional strategies/methods and increased student academic achievement in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p> <p>No research is cited.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>Some research is cited</b> that will allow a qualified educator to reasonably assume that the identified program components and specific instructional strategies/methods are related to increasing student academic achievement in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	<p><b>Research clearly indicates</b> that each instructional strategy/method and each major program component has a history of increasing student academic achievement in the intended subject areas and grade levels particularly for low-income and/or underachieving students.</p>	

**Comments**

**Points this Section, Maximum of 10:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Must score 6 or higher to be recommended)

**4. Connection to Content Expectations – 10 points possible; must receive a score of 6 or higher to be recommended for approval.**

**Rationale:** NCLB Section 1116(e)(5)(B) requires applicants to demonstrate that the instruction they provide and the content they use “are consistent with the instruction provided and content used by the local educational agency and state, and are aligned with state student academic achievement standards.” According to the U.S. Department of Education (January 14, 2009), instructional content and methods need not be identical to those of the LEA, but they must “*share a focus* on the same state academic content and achievement standards and be designed to help students meet those standards” (*Federal Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance*, p. 15). In addition, an applicant must provide evidence that its instructional methods and content are aligned with state academic content and student academic achievement standards, and are of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of eligible children (Final Title I Regulations of October, 2008).

**Alignment – 5 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
<p><b>Insufficient evidence</b> is provided that the instructional program aligns to Grade Level Content Expectations, High School Content Expectations, Course/Credit Content Expectations and/or the Michigan Curriculum Framework for the grade levels the applicant intends to serve.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>Less-detailed</b> evidence is provided. However, <b>evidence alludes</b> to the instructional program being aligned to Grade Level Content Expectations, High School Content Expectations, Course/Credit Content Expectations and/or the Michigan Curriculum Framework for the grade levels the applicant intends to serve.</p>	<p><b>Detailed evidence</b> is provided that demonstrates the instructional program is aligned to specific Grade Level Content Expectations, High School Content Expectations, Course/Credit Content Expectations and/or the Michigan Curriculum Framework for the grade levels the applicant intends to serve.</p>	

**Criterion 4 rubric continues on next page**

**Sample Learning Objective – 5 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
<p>A sample student learning objective that demonstrates alignment to a specific Grade Level Content Expectation or High School Content Expectation appropriate to a grade level the applicant intends to serve <b>is not provided</b></p> <p>Response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>A sample student learning objective</b> that demonstrates how the applicant’s program, methods, or curriculum are aligned to a specific Grade Level Content Expectations or High School Content Expectation appropriate to a grade level the applicant intends to serve <b>is provided.</b></p>	<p><b>Detailed sample student learning objectives</b> that demonstrate how the applicant’s program, methods, or curriculum are aligned to a specific Grade Level Content Expectations or High School Content Expectations appropriate to the grade levels applicant intends to serve <b>are provided</b> for <b>each subject area</b> the applicant will offer services in.</p>	

**Comments**

**Points this Section, Maximum of 10:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Must score 6 or higher to be recommended)

**5. Staff Qualifications – 10 points possible; must receive a score of 6 or higher to be recommended for approval.**

**Rationale:** NCLB Section 1116(e)(5)(B) requires applicants to demonstrate that the instruction they provide and the content they use “are consistent with the instruction provided and content used by the local educational agency and state, and are aligned with state student academic achievement standards.” According to the U.S. Department of Education (January 14, 2009), instructional content and methods need not be identical to those of the LEA, but they must “*share a focus* on the same state academic content and achievement standards and be designed to help students meet those standards” (*Federal Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance*, p. 15). In addition, an applicant must provide evidence that its instructional methods and content are aligned with state academic content and student academic achievement standards, and are of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of eligible children (Final Title I Regulations of October, 2008).

**Staff Qualifications – 5 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
<p>Qualifications of the instructors <b>do not meet the minimum criteria.</b></p> <p>It <b>appears</b> that instructors meet the minimum requirement of having a high school diploma.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>Clearly-defined qualifications</b> of instructors are <b>evident and reasonable.</b></p> <p>Instructors are required to <b>meet the minimum requirement of having a high school diploma</b>, or instructors are selected on the basis of criteria that indicate they exceed the minimum qualifications.</p> <p>Examples may include individuals that are not certified teachers, but hold a BA or MA.</p>	<p><b>Detailed instructor qualifications</b> with <b>clearly written examples</b> are provided.</p> <p>Instructors are selected on the basis of criteria that indicate they exhibit <b>superior qualifications.</b></p> <p>Examples may include currently- or formerly-certified English language arts and/or mathematics teachers. Teachers may be certified in any state.</p>	

**Criterion 5 rubric continues on next page**

**Professional Development – 5 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
<p>Professional development and supervision plan are <b>minimally addressed</b> but are <b>not systematic</b>.</p> <p>There is <b>no professional development</b> or supervision plan.</p> <p>The response does not address the question.</p>	<p><b>Most indicators</b> of professional development and supervision addressed effectively. This should include instructional strategies, assessment, communication, and differentiated instruction. A systemic plan for professional development is evident.</p>	<p>There is an <b>effective, systemic and ongoing plan</b> for professional development and supervision that addresses instructional strategies, focus on learning, assessment &amp; communication of progress to students, parents and districts, documentation of tutoring sessions and student progress, differentiation of instruction based on diagnosed student needs and feedback to students and employees.</p>	

**Comments**

**Points this Section, Maximum of 10: \_\_\_\_\_**  
(Must score 6 or higher to be recommended)

**6. Assessment of Student Need -10 points possible; must receive a score of 6 or higher to be recommended for approval.**

**Rationale:** NCLB Section 1116(e)(5)(B) requires applicants to demonstrate that the instruction they provide and the content they use “are consistent with the instruction provided and content used by the local educational agency and state, and are aligned with state student academic achievement standards.” According to the U.S. Department of Education (January 14, 2009), instructional content and methods need not be identical to those of the LEA, but they must “*share a focus* on the same state academic content and achievement standards and be designed to help students meet those standards” (*Federal Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance*, p. 15). In addition, an applicant must provide evidence that its instructional methods and content are aligned with state academic content and student academic achievement standards, and are of high quality, research-based, and specifically designed to increase the academic achievement of eligible children (Final Title I Regulations of October, 2008).

**Objective Assessment – 5 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
<p>Evidence of objective assessment(s) is <b>not provided</b>.</p> <p>Objective assessment(s) are <b>infrequent (i.e., pre-test, post-test only)</b>.</p> <p>Response does not address the question.</p>	<p>Applicant describes objective assessment(s) to be <b>used frequently</b>. <b>In addition to</b> the pre-test and post-test. The applicant indicates there is <b>ongoing assessment</b>, but <b>does not specify</b> the <b>frequency</b> of assessment.</p>	<p>Applicant describes objective assessment(s) to be used <b>more frequently</b>. <b>In addition to</b> the pre-test and post-test, evidence is provided that assessment <b>is ongoing</b> and <b>occurs 3 or more times</b> during the provision of services</p>	

**Systematic Process For Analyzing Results – 5 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
<p>Instructors rely solely on their <b>own judgment</b> or applicant <b>does not identify a systematic process for analyzing results</b> to identify student needs, skill or knowledge gaps, and prescribing an instructional program based on student needs.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p>Applicant provides <b>evidence of a systematic process for analyzing results</b> to identify student needs, skill or knowledge gaps, and prescribing an instructional program based on student needs.</p>	<p>Applicant provides <b>detailed evidence of a comprehensive, systematic process for analyzing results</b> to identify student needs, skill or knowledge gaps, and prescribing an instructional program based on student needs.</p>	

**Criterion 6 comments are on the next page**

**Comments**

**Points this Section, Maximum of 10:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Must score 6 or higher to be recommended)

**7. Communication Plan – 10 points possible; must receive a score of 5 or higher to be recommended for approval.**

**Rationale:** NCLB Section 1116(e)(5)(B) requires applicants to demonstrate that the instruction they provide and the content they use “are consistent with the instruction provided and content used by the local educational agency and state, and are aligned with state student academic achievement standards.” According to the U.S. Department of Education (January 14, 2009), instructional content and methods need not be identical to those of the LEA, but they must “*share a focus* on the same state academic content and achievement standards and be designed to help students meet those standards” (*Federal Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance*, p. 15).

**Plan for Communicating Student Progress – 4 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-1 points)	Recommended (2-3 points)	Highly Recommended (4 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 4 POINTS</b>
<p>Applicant provides <b>minimal or no evidence</b> of a <b>process or plan</b> for communicating student progress to LEA(s)/teacher(s), and parent(s)/guardian(s)</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p>Applicant provides <b>evidence of a process or plan</b> for communicating student progress to LEA(s)/teacher(s), and parent(s)/guardian(s).</p>	<p>Applicant provides <b>evidence of an effective and well developed process or plan</b> for communicating student progress to LEA(s)/teacher(s), and parent(s)/guardian(s).</p>	

**Plan for Obtaining Parent Feedback - 4 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0-1 points)	Recommended (2-3 points)	Highly Recommended (4 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 4 POINTS</b>
<p>There is no evidence of a process for obtaining parent feedback on their child’s tutoring.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p>The communication plan provides <b>evidence</b> of a <b>process or plan</b> for obtaining parent feedback related to their child’s instructional goals.</p>	<p>The communication plan provides <b>evidence of an effective and well developed process or plan</b> for obtaining parent feedback related to their child’s instructional goals. Strategies for parent involvement are clear.</p>	

**Criterion 7 rubric continues on next page**

**Frequency of Communication – 2 Points Possible**

Not Recommended (0 points)	Recommended (1 point)	Highly Recommended (2 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 2 POINTS</b>
<p>Applicant provides <b>minimal or no evidence</b> that communication will occur with any regularity.</p> <p>Applicant does not provide a response or the response does not address the question.</p>	<p>Applicant provides evidence that <b>distribution is less frequent (e.g., quarterly to monthly).</b></p>	<p>Applicant provides evidence that <b>distribution is more frequent (e.g., every two weeks or less).</b></p>	

**Comments**

**Points this Section, Maximum of 10: \_\_\_\_\_**  
(Must score 5 or higher to be recommended)

**8. Fluency and Mechanics – 5 points possible; must have a score of 3 or higher to be recommended for approval.**

**Rationale:** By definition, SES is tutoring that is high quality, based on research, and designed to increase student academic achievement [NCLB, Section 1116(e)(12)(C)(2)]. According to the U.S. Department of Education (January 14, 2009), the major focus of NCLB is to utilize *only* those educational practices that have evidence to suggest that they will increase academic achievement (see *Federal Supplemental Educational Services Non-Regulatory Guidance*).

Not Recommended (0-2 points)	Recommended (3-4 points)	Highly Recommended (5 points)	<b>MAXIMUM 5 POINTS</b>
Spelling and grammatical <b>errors are frequent and distracting.</b>	Spelling and grammatical <b>errors are present, but don't distract</b> the reviewer <b>or interfere</b> with interpretation of content.	<b>Tight control</b> over spelling and grammar.	

**Comments**

**Points this Section, Maximum of 5:** \_\_\_\_\_  
(Must score 3 or higher to be recommended)